

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion



VOL. VIII, No. 23

JANUARY 10, 1949

\$2.00 per year; 10 cents per copy

Those Who Decide to Stay

MISSIONARIES from America and other Western countries in China have had to make a most difficult decision. Those who have decided to withdraw have often had good grounds for doing so. They have had to consider the possibility that in view of the anti-American attitudes of Communists, their presence might be an embarrassment to the Chinese church. This possibility is a reason for withdrawal in some situations. This may be especially true of missionaries who have been closely associated with the Nationalist government. Family responsibilities and personal health would in other cases be good reasons for withdrawal. This editorial is not written to suggest any criticism of missionaries who withdraw, but rather to call attention to the debt which the whole Christian world owes to those missionaries, who at the invitation of the Chinese, decide to stay in those parts of China that have come under, or may soon come under, Communist rule. Our prayers and our loyal gratitude should go with them, for they have taken a step into the unknown. That there will be serious privations ahead of them is likely and they may run great personal risks. As one of them writes: "Now is not the time to go. This is a time to hang on. Just living here at this time may mean more for the Kingdom than years of work elsewhere."

Another, well known to many readers of this journal, writes: "There is God's work to do here right now. It will be different if, in the future, it becomes clear that there is no more Christian work which can be done." He adds: "How can we doubt that God is in control of the history just ahead of us, or that our work will be used for His glory, whether we succeed or fail."

These attitudes correspond with the words of a Chinese Christian leader in a recent letter lamenting the departure of many missionaries. He says: "It raises the question as to whether Christianity can only thrive under a certain political and economic regime."

There are two opposite errors that Americans often make about Chinese Communism. The first is the mistaken assumption that Chinese Communism is, at its center, a different kind of Communism,

and that one can expect it to be in intention more tolerant than Communism in Russia and Eastern Europe. There is no good ground for this assumption. The tendency is for legitimate condemnations of the national government, and for legitimate appreciation of short run Communist policies and practices in comparison with the corruption and reactionary tendencies ascribed to the government, to blind many observers to the fact that the core of Communism in China is the same modified Marxism that is the core of Russian Communism. There is no reason to expect more freedom or less ruthlessness under the one, so far as its leadership is concerned, than under the other.

The opposite error is to deduce from the Marxist and Russian orientation of the leadership of Chinese Communism, as a movement, a fixed pattern as to what can be expected to happen, to overlook the many intangible human factors that may make the total effect of Communism in China different from the total effect of Communism in Russia. The present Communist tactics are more favorable to the church and the missionaries than the tactics of less than a year ago. That may not prove a great deal because Communist tactics are so notoriously subject to change. More important is what the Chinese character, and the Chinese culture, and the Chinese national interest may do to Communism during the next period, in which a comparatively few indoctrinated Communists may have the task of organizing a nation of hundreds of millions of people, a nation that is known for its freedom from fanaticism, for its embodiment of the virtues of the middle way. John King Fairbank, in his very widely praised book, *The United States and China*, says that "it is incredible that Modern China, the greatest and oldest single mass of humanity, could be brought into the orbit of any foreign power—Russian, American or any other—except in so far as China's own inner development itself conduced to such an orientation."

If one avoids both of these errors, both an optimistic interpretation of Communism as a movement in China and an abstract reading of how Communism

will affect the daily life of that vast country, one can see the reasons why many missionaries decide to remain under Communist rule, and why every effort is being made to keep Christian institutions open. As one very able teacher has written, they do not want to make the mistake of deciding in advance what it will be impossible to do, for to make that decision in advance may mean that the greatest opportunity for missionary work will be lost. To stay under such conditions of uncertainty may mean some danger of being cut off from the outside world indefinitely with opportunities for significant work denied. But a better possibility may still be open, and whether or not it is open will be known through the devotion and courage and resourcefulness of those who decide to stay. This better possibility will be the development of new forms of Christian life and work under the shadow of Communist power and in response to Communist influence. It may take the close proximity of Communism to bring out the revolutionary elements in Christianity and to free the church from its dependence upon middle class patterns of life.

Neither the Chinese church nor missionaries, who remain to serve it, should be handicapped by the kind of criticism here that is based upon the widespread tendency to see everything in terms of the conflict between Communism and Western democracy. Those who must live with Communism can be right in seeking points of contact with it on the social and economic level which may arouse questions among those who live in a distant society where the available alternatives are entirely different. They should be supported in every way possible by us who do not share any of their privations or any of their dangers. J. C. B.

Editorial Notes

We have had occasion in previous editorial notes to call attention to the unfavorable impression which the present conduct of the Nuremberg trials is making in Europe, more particularly to the questionable conduct of the public prosecutor, Mr. Kempner. A note from Bishop Berggrav, the Primate of Norway, emphasizes the importance of this matter in the mind of anti-Nazi Europeans. Bishop Berggrav writes: "This is to thank you for your note in *Christianity and Crisis* about Kempner and the Weizsaecker case. I gave my testimony in the court in June and was cross-examined by Kempner. He was a most Gestapo-like man. My idea is that he, as a German, should never have been trusted by the Americans as a prosecutor on their behalf. I have been looking for voices from America in this

matter. I was happy, therefore, when I saw your article. The honor of America is at stake." The Weizsaecker case refers to a German secretary of state who was involved in the plot on Hitler's life and who gave many other evidences of his consistent anti-Nazi stand. Despite the fact that even the President of the Swiss Federation and Bishop Berggrav testified in his behalf, the German-American prosecutor sought his conviction as a war criminal, on the ground that he initialed many dubious Nazi documents during his tenure of office. The fact that it is so difficult to gain public attention for the moral problems of these trials, represents one of the hazards of American power today. It is wielded in places so remote from the home base that the light of public opinion does not play upon our policy.

A debate, which has developed in New York state with reference to its divorce laws, illustrates one of the difficulties in the relations between Protestants and Catholics. The State of New York has not changed its divorce laws since the eighteenth century. According to these laws adultery is the only ground for divorce. Meanwhile a culture has developed in a modern urban secular community in which divorce for many other causes is publicly approved or condoned. The inevitable consequence is that the law is circumvented. The form of circumvention, discovered by the District Attorney of New York, is "faked" testimony proving adultery, even though neither party has been guilty of it.

This situation prompted a demand for a liberalization of the divorce laws. Catholic authorities, however, declared that this development proved the necessity of making divorce laws more stringent and eliminating even adultery as ground for divorce. One Catholic dignitary, preaching in the Cathedral, declared that divorce was the evil fruit of "apostates from the Catholic faith who call themselves reformers." The belief of Catholics that a rigorous insistence on the indissolubility of marriage can be preserved merely by legal sanction in a community which lacks every presupposition for such a standard, reveals a shocking reliance upon law as the basis of morals. Protestants were guilty of this same error during the prohibition movement. Both Catholics and Protestants ought to know that no moral standard can be enforced by the police power of the state if the overwhelming portion of the population does not abide by it voluntarily. Police power can deal only with the recalcitrance of a minority.

We may well question Catholic legalism even when it is exercised within the church itself. We may ask whether the sacramental character of the

marriage relation can be preserved by law when the disloyalty of one or both partners has in fact violated the sacrament. From the Protestant standpoint, Catholicism places too great a reliance upon law, even within the Christian community. There are certain ideal standards of personal conduct and of human relations which may be preserved by grace but not by law. If grace is lacking no legal sanction can make such standards either possible or sufferable. But so long as Catholic legalism is limited to its own religious community we do not have the same concern about it as when it seeks to enforce impossible standards upon a whole civil community.

This problem represents one of the many instances where Protestant Christianity must develop its own middle ground, distinguished from both the Catholic and the secular position. Such a ground requires that we seek to preserve the sacramental conception of marriage in opposition to the secular community's concept of marriage as a mere social contract, in

which only the two contracting parties are engaged. But it also involves opposition to the Catholic effort to preserve by legal sanction what can only be maintained by every resource of grace. The decay of American family life is a shocking aspect of a general moral decay. A thoughtful judge recently expressed the opinion that half of all cases of child delinquency are caused by broken homes. Stringent laws may be necessary to protect the rights of children in the home as much as possible. But law does not have the power to prompt incompatibility to be transmuted into compatibility by forgiveness, or to induce the kind of patience and mutual forbearance which makes intimate relations sufferable. There is a certain Catholic nation permitting no divorces on any ground, in which, according to report, half of all homicides are committed by irate husbands and wives upon their spouses. There is a lesson worth pondering in those statistics. R. N.

Nature of the Church in the Light of Lambeth

WILLIAM J. WOLF

Historical Introduction

FOR five weeks this summer 329 bishops representing all of the self-governing branches of the Anglican Communion and its missionary dioceses met at Lambeth at the invitation of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Lambeth is a purely consultative body that meets approximately every ten years; its recommendations require enactment by each province or national church before they can be binding for that church. This limitation must be understood in analyzing the significance of the report for a doctrine of the church.

The central problem for discussion in Lambeth Conferences has been the relations of the Anglican Communion with other Christian churches throughout the world. Lambeth in 1920 issued an "Appeal to all Christian people" to unite on the basis of four points which had first been suggested in somewhat different terms by the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the U. S. in 1886.

"We believe that the visible unity of the Church will be found to involve the whole-hearted acceptance of:

"The Holy Scriptures as the record of God's revelation of Himself to man, and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith; and the Creed, commonly called Nicene, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith, and either it or the Apostles' Creed as the Baptismal Confession of belief:

"The divinely instituted sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion, as expressing for all the cor-

porate life of the whole fellowship in and with Christ;

"A ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also the commission of Christ and the authority of the whole body."

In 1930 the section on the ministry in this "Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral" was clarified to mean the historic episcopate. This institution was further defined as follows:

"The historic episcopate as we understand it goes behind the perversions of history to the original conception of the Apostolic Ministry. . . . It is characterized by succession in two forms: the succession in office and the succession in consecration. . . . When, therefore, we say that we must insist on the historic episcopate but not upon any theory or interpretation of it, we are not to be understood as insisting on the office apart from the functions."

The same conference reviewed the proposed constitution for the Church of South India and expressed its "strong desire that, as soon as negotiations are successfully completed, the venture should be made and the union inaugurated."

The Report of the Committee on the Unity of the Church

The special committee on "The Unity of the Church" was chaired by the Bishop of Chichester, Dr. Bell. Its three sub-committees on relationships with the Church of South India, with non-episcopal churches, and with episcopal churches and the

Ecumenical Movement were headed respectively by Bishop Rawlinson of Derby, Bishop Dun of Washington, and Bishop Bell. The report carries the authority of the whole committee, but not of the conference itself.

It is not at all clear from these reports what conception of the church underlies the recommendations. In spite of a reiterated resolve that future negotiations looking toward organic union shall face "the theological issues, especially those concerning the church and the ministry," there is no clear reference to first principles upon which such reconstruction must take place. The nearest approach to such definition is the committee's statement that the Quadrilateral constitutes the "right guidance," but actually this is only amplified as regards the episcopate. It states that by the Preface of the Ordinal episcopal ordination is a necessary condition within Anglicanism for the "exercise of the ministry of the church." It then records two quite conflicting interpretations of the episcopate by which one group regards the institution as so essential to the Church that non-episcopal ministries "are not ministries of the church and lack that authoritative commission without which there can be no guaranteed priestly ministrations" and by which another group, while recognizing episcopacy as the norm, feels bound "in view of the manifest blessing of God on non-episcopal ministries, to recognize those ministries as true ministries and their sacraments as true sacraments." A non-Anglican reading the report would conclude that the central feature of the Anglican view of the church is the maintenance of the historic succession of its bishops without clear definition as to what episcopacy means.

"It follows from the principle set out above as uniting all Anglicans that the acceptance of episcopacy as part of the life of the Church, and of episcopal ordination as the rule of the Church, is a prerequisite for the formation of a united Church with Anglican participation, or for the establishment of rules of intercommunion. But room must be left for varying interpretations of the fact of episcopacy, provided that the historic succession is maintained, and that the functions of the episcopate are such as have been traditionally assigned to it."

The report acknowledges the inconvenient tensions caused within Anglicanism by two such divergent views of the episcopate, but under a plea for "comprehensiveness" reconciles such contradiction as "the will of God for us." The outsider might consider it less a manifestation of the divine will than complacent timidity and the failure to analyze a situation with reference to first principles.

That an episcopally ordained ministry is the central point in modern Anglicanism is made still more clear by the sub-committee's report on the Church of South India. It expresses gratitude to God for

the union, emphasizes the uniqueness of this church in combining "the heirs of the Protestant Reformation and a church which retained the Catholic tradition as it is known in the Church of England," and pledges itself to "do all in our power by work and prayer alike" to speed the time when "there shall be full communion between the Church of South India and the churches of our communion." It reviews the course of the negotiations leading to the formation of the new church and states that the form of union as presented to the Lambeth Conference in 1930 was more satisfactory than the one later adopted. It records the recommendations of the Archbishop of Canterbury's Committee of Theologians set up in 1946 to advise him on the proposed revised constitution. Since the entire Conference in Resolution 53 makes reference to the six points of this committee and hopes that the authorities of the new church will amend their constitution along these lines, these items are important to show what greater concessions than those embodied in the Church of South India must be made by non-Anglicans in order for future schemes of reunion to expect full endorsement from Lambeth.

"A clear majority of the Committee is disposed, with varying degrees of emphasis, to regard as being likely to be essential, if in the end there is to be full intercommunion with the Anglican Churches, the amendment of the Constitution in some or all of the following ways:

"1. The statement of the Faith of the Church should be so redrafted as to place the adherence of the Church of South India to the historic faith of the Church Catholic beyond question.

"2. The statement on the Sacraments in the Church should be freed from misleading ambiguities.

"3. The use of the rite of Confirmation should, as soon as may be practicable, be made the general rule of the Church.

"4. There should be a modification of the rules for synodical procedure, clarifying and properly safeguarding the position of the Bishops.

"5. There should be reconsideration of the ultimate relation of the Church of South India to other Churches not episcopally ordered.

"6. There should be a satisfactory clarification of the circumstances, if any, in which non-episcopally ordained ministers may continue to exercise ministry in the Church of South India at the conclusion of the interim period."

The May, 1947, proposals for a United Church in Ceylon are highly commended because they envisage from the start a unified episcopally ordained ministry.

The report of the sub-committee on relations with non-episcopal churches divides proposed plans of union into two main types: schemes for organic or corporate union and schemes for intercommunion

on the basis of a mutually recognized ministry. The first type seems definitely to be preferred over the second as looking toward a greater measure of unity as the final goal.

"We must press boldly toward unions with which the Anglican Churches can be in full communion. . . . This involves, as we have said, that each new united Church should organize itself at the earliest possible moment on the basis of a fully unified episcopal ministry."

The second type which seeks a mutually recognized ministry is illustrated by the Canadian and Australian plans which, though differing in whether such recognition shall be optional and limited or constitutionally universal, are alike in seeking a presbyterate or priesthood recognized by all the churches concerned. Another form of this second type is illustrated by reference to the Archbishop of Canterbury's sermon at Cambridge in November, 1946, in which, in view of the situation of establishment, he envisaged acceptance by the free churches of the historic episcopate adapted to their special needs. Such a plan would involve parallel but mutually acceptable episcopates as the basis for intercommunion. The report lists disadvantages to plans of the second type: (1) failure to provide for real growth together of the parallel churches, (2) doubt whether such suggestion will be attractive to non-episcopal churches if nothing more than partial intercommunion is offered, and (3) reservations about episcopacy "in vacuo." Such plans are declared to violate the Lambeth Appeal of 1920 by not recognizing the qualification imposed in that document: "terms of union having been otherwise satisfactorily adjusted."

The report summarizes the stage of negotiations with the Church of Scotland, the Free Churches in England, in Ceylon, in North India, in Iran, in Nigeria and with the Philippine Independent Church. It issued a most significant statement, later passed as a resolution of the entire conference, on the request of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the U. S. A. in 1946 to prepare a statement of Faith and Order "in harmony with the Lambeth Quadrilateral, upon which the Protestant Episcopal Church is prepared to enter into intercommunion and to proceed toward organic federation with the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. or with any interested Christian body."

"The Conference agrees that the Statement of Faith and Order prepared by the Joint Commission on Approaches to Unity of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America is in entire harmony with the Lambeth Quadrilateral, and may be used in negotiations of the Protestant Episcopal Church with any interested Christian body."

The report recommends that all future plans for union with non-Anglican Churches should be re-

ferred to Lambeth or if urgent action is required, to the metropolitans of all the Anglican Churches or Provinces. Then follows a significant statement on the relation of the ministry to the church.

"There is a danger that efforts to solve the problem of the ministry in detachment from the problem of the Church may lead to administrative and disciplinary confusion as well as theological ambiguities. The ministry is, in our view, an organ of Christ in His Body and can only function healthily in the Body."

The sub-committee on relations with episcopal churches and the Ecumenical Movement surveys the situation with regard to the Roman Catholic Church, the Eastern Orthodox Church, the Lesser Eastern Churches, the Old Catholic Churches, and the Scandinavian Churches. The most significant item here bearing on the nature of the church is the praise accorded the document establishing intercommunion between the two churches as a precedent "for similar agreements with other independent churches."

"Intercommunion does not require from either Communion the acceptance of all doctrinal opinion, sacramental devotion, or liturgical practice characteristic of the other, but implies that each believes the other to hold all the essentials of the Christian faith."

The Resolutions

The resolutions bear the authority of the entire Conference, but it must be remembered that the Conference itself is only a consultative body. On the whole the resolutions support most of the recommendations of the committee on unity. Its action on South India may be summarized as follows:

1. Former Anglicans now members of the new church will be allowed in Anglican jurisdiction all rights and privileges of Anglicans.

2. Non-episcopally ordained ministers acquire no new rights or status in relation to the Anglican Communion as a whole.

3. "In regard to the bishops, presbyters, and deacons consecrated or ordained in the Church of South India at or after the inauguration of that Church, the Conference is unable to make one recommendation agreed to by all. It therefore records the two following views:

- (a) "One view (held by a majority) that such bishops, presbyters, and deacons should be acknowledged as true bishops, presbyters, and deacons in the Church of Christ and should be accepted as such in every part of the Anglican Communion. . . .

- (b) "Another view (held by a substantial minority) that it is not yet possible to pass any definite judgment upon the precise status of such bishops, presbyters, and deacons in the Church of Christ or to recommend that they be accepted in the Anglican Communion as bishops, presbyters, or deacons."

Summary

It should be evident from the preceding survey that the Lambeth Conference has not produced a clear definition of the nature of the church. Surprisingly absent is any direct reference to the Biblical view of the church as the norm for a communion which in its official formularies exalts Scripture as the supreme authority and defines the church in Article XIX as "a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly administered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same." This Lambeth document shows much more caution and studied ambiguity than the historic Anglicanism of the 16th and 17th centuries as shown in Prof. Sykes' survey of the friendly relations with non-episcopal Continental churches at that period when its formularies were still live documents. It is interesting that the Lutheran Church of Sweden has preserved the historic episcopate without the obsession about episcopacy that characterizes modern Anglicanism.

As regards the possible contributions of Anglicanism to future ecumenical plans it is extremely hopeful that Lambeth still stands by the Quadrilateral as against strong pressure from the right to repudiate it. It stands for the historic episcopate, but urges that room "be left for varying interpretations of the fact of episcopacy, provided that the historic succession is maintained, and that the functions of the episcopate are such as have been traditionally assigned to it."

This last qualification receives no real definition from the Conference. It does nothing to clarify the situation encountered when Anglicans are told by interested Christian churches that they cannot make out what this Anglican Church is with which they are being asked to merge.

That episcopacy is not, however, the sole demand that will be made on other Christian bodies is clear from the report. "None of us hold that tactual succession and correct formulae of ordination can guarantee a true and effectual episcopate or presbyterate apart from the faith and corporate life in which they are set." The minimal forms of such "faith and corporate life" are never listed in such a way as to give positive guidance for future negotiations. The agreement with the Old Catholics "does not require from either communion the acceptance of all doctrinal opinion, sacramental devotion, or liturgical practice characteristic of the other, but implies that each believes the other to hold all the essentials of the Christian faith." What these "essentials" are which the Old Catholics have, but which the new bishops of the Church of South India consecrated by Anglican formularies by Anglican bishops in the historic succession may not have in

"the opinion of a substantial minority" are never clarified. The machinery for future negotiations is left in a most unsatisfactory state by urging reference to the next Lambeth Conference which will probably not meet until twelve years hence. Interim reference to the metropolitans surely is not a workable procedure for they will hesitate to commit themselves without a Lambeth review.

Church-State Tensions Grow in Czechoslovakia

CHURCH-STATE tensions in Czechoslovakia have increased during recent weeks. Prospects are that the New Year may see the Communist-dominated government in open and sharp conflict with churches accused of "reactionary" attitudes toward the new "democratic" regime.

The Roman Catholic Church, which last August accused the government of carrying on "a great secret anti-church fight," has been the No. 1 target of Communist propagandists who have warned that "no church must become a shelter for those who defend the old order and Mammon."

At the same time, "certain Protestant denominations" have evoked Communist censure for their apparently uncooperative attitude toward government-sponsored measures.

Protestant clergymen are serving on central action committees set up by the State as representative groups to which questions concerning the denominations can be submitted. However, a number of clergymen have stated frankly that they are sitting on the committees merely to prevent Communists from occupying their seats.

One member of the Supreme Action Committee in Prague is Dr. Joseph L. Hromadka, of the John Hus Theological Faculty in Prague University, who has given partial support to the Communist-controlled government, but at the same time is on record as saying: "If the Communists restrict my freedom, I know what I will do. I will say No. I will go to prison."

In a significant address last November, copies of which were to be distributed among Czech Protestants, Dr. Hromadka declared that while Christians need not protest against social, economic and political changes, they "must prepare for the moment when we must cry aloud: Touch not that which is for us the supreme authority."

The tendency in Czechoslovakia, as in other Communist-ruled countries, is toward greater control over the churches. At present it is not possible for a church to publish anything without State approval, and clergymen may not preach sermons criticizing the regime.

So far, the most outspoken stand has been taken by the Roman Catholic Church, but it remains to be seen how long other churches can keep silent in the face of the fiat laid down by Premier Antonin Zapotocky, who said last July: "There are not two republics in this country, a spiritual and a temporal, but only a people's democratic republic and a single constitution which solemnly affirms that the whole source of power in this country is the people and nobody else."

Despite claims that the Czech constitution provides the "fullest religious liberty," the Catholic Church has been subjected to various restrictions. It is now being threatened with the nationalization

of all church schools unless some form of understanding is established between the State and the Czech hierarchy—a possibility that grows increasingly remote.

Signs of anti-Catholic pressure have been especially apparent in Slovakia where chapels in all State boarding schools have been closed, almost all Catholic periodicals suppressed, and young children organized in labor battalions on Sundays. In addition, a Catholic seminary has been ordered closed, with others facing the same fate, and Slovak bishops due to make *ad limina* (to the threshold) visits to the Vatican have been denied official permission to leave the country.—*Religious News Service*.

The World Church: News and Notes

The Imprisonment of a New Testament Professor

Professor Oscar Cullman, Professor of New Testament at the University of Basel, recently published an appeal in the *Kirchenblatt* of Switzerland in behalf of Professor Ernest Lohmeyer who is a prisoner in eastern Germany. Professor Lohmeyer was an outstanding anti-Nazi, so much so that the Russians appointed him rector of the University of Greifswald. Subsequently they imprisoned him. Neither the place of nor the reason for his imprisonment have been made public. Professor Cullman asks why it is that the World Church which was so very much concerned over Pastor Niemoeller's imprisonment, allows this imprisonment to go completely unnoticed.

Christian Group Condemns Dutch "Aggression"

The Indonesian Christian Association in the Netherlands has issued a statement condemning Netherlands "aggression" against the Indonesian Republic.

"We are overcome," the statement declared, "by the horrible news of Netherlands aggression against the Indonesian Republic at a moment when Indonesian Christians in the Netherlands with their Moslem compatriots commemorate the birth of the Prince of Peace."

The statement stressed that the "Netherlands act on the last Advent Sunday of 1948 contradicts the joyful message of Christianity."

It called on all Indonesian Christians "to continue in solidarity with and loyalty to their people, carrying out the Christian faith."—*Religious News Service*.

What Chinese Communists Are Like

A missionary in China sends the following interesting characterization of Chinese Communism:

"Several people have asked what the Communists are like; and it is not easy to answer in brief. I hope the following is true: They are Marxists and always have been; but they are much closer to Moscow now than they were during the war years when they were weaker

in relation to the Kuomintang and more in need of Anglo-Saxon support and Russia was less able to help them; they are anti-American and anti-Catholic, and usually also anti-Western and anti-Christian. (There is already a substantial roll of martyrs: but persecution varies with the personality of the local boss.) They are reported to be considerably more ruthless in their treatment of the local population than they used to be, and in certain areas the entire population has cleared out before them. On the other hand they are not an artificial importation, but spring out of conditions in China, and address themselves to the reform of certain crying abuses, e.g., the conditions of land tenure. This—and their greater efficiency and honesty—account for the pull they have on many people outside their own territory, and for the fear they excite—which is carefully fostered by their opponents.

"I do not believe, however, that they are wanted here. I should hazard the guess that feelings here are dreadfully like feelings in Europe. We do not believe much in 'Western democracy,' in our side (to which Nanking does belong); and we don't like Communist totalitarianism either (though we have a reluctant admiration for its efficiency balanced by a sense that in the end the U. S. A., as the wealthiest and strongest power, will probably win in the end, so perhaps we had best be on her side). This makes for passivity—which we have here; and many people are left feeling that their best hope is the emergence of a 'good warlord' in their area who will preserve order and give some kind of adequate government, and insulate us from what may happen elsewhere. That this can be offered as the 'best we can hope for' is truly tragic after the hopes and struggles of the last thirty years."

Anglican, United Churchmen To Resume Union Negotiations

Negotiations looking toward union of the Church of England in Canada and the United Church of Canada will be resumed in January by committees of the two communions.

The two churches have been carrying on union "con-

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion
537 West 121st St., New York 27, N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, *Chairman*

JOHN C. BENNETT

LISTON POPE

F. ERNEST JOHNSON

HENRY P. VAN DUSEN

GLOSTER MORRIS, *Secretary*

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JAMES C. BAKER

HENRY SMITH LEIPER

HENRY SLOANE COFFIN

JOHN A. MACKAY

CHARLES W. GILKEY

RHODA E. MCCULLOCH

LYNN HAROLD HOUGH

FRANCIS P. MILLER

UMPHREY LEE

EDWARD L. PARSONS

HOWARD CHANDLER ROBBINS

versations" for more than two years, but the talks have been confined recently to discussions on how a common ministry can be achieved.

Some churches in Toronto and western Canada have already established a mutually-acceptable ministry. Two Toronto congregations which accept clergy of either communion are the Church of the Transfiguration (Church of England in Canada) and Glebe Road United Church.—*Religious News Service.*

De Gaulle Pledges State Support for Church Schools

State support for church schools was publicly pledged for the first time by General Charles de Gaulle in an address at closing sessions of the Reunion of the French People (RFP), now the leading group in the Council of the Republic.

General de Gaulle told the RFP congress that hundreds of church schools are on the verge of closing because they lack financial support.

Periodical Division

Detroit Public Library

5201 Woodward Ave.

Detroit 2, Mich.

650 1-50

"There is no reason," he said, "why private establishments should not be given help. The RFP will support liberty of education, for if the private schools were to disappear, it would do great harm to the nation and the cause of civic peace. Private schools must, therefore, be allowed to survive within the framework of present laws, and we should be able to arrive at this result without having to fight for it."

Taking issue with anti-clerical Communists and Socialists who continue to refuse subsidies for church schools, General de Gaulle warned that the issue of church school support threatens to divide the French people. He said it is essential to place the debate "in a new aspect and on a different plane" in order to preserve national unity.—*Religious News Service.*

Pakistan Supports Right To Change Religious Belief

In a surprise move, the Pakistan delegation to the UN expressed support of Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which guarantees religious liberty, including freedom to change one's religion or belief.

The Pakistan stand was announced by Sir Mohammed Zafrullah Khan just before the UN General Assembly adopted the Declaration.

(Earlier, in UN committee meetings on the Declaration, delegates representing Moslem countries had generally opposed Article 19, particularly the clause referring to the freedom to change one's religion.)

In explaining his support of Article 19, Sir Mohammed stressed that the Koran, the Moslem holy book, teaches there shall be no compulsion in matters of faith, and leaves it open to the individual to choose in what he will or will not believe.

"Islam is a missionary religion," he added. "It claims the right and freedom to persuade any man to change his faith and accept Islam. Surely and obviously it must equally yield to other faiths the free right of conversion."

"It would be unreasonable to claim the right of conversion and deny it to others."

Sir Mohammed paid tribute to Christian missionary activity in the East, particularly its accomplishments in education and medicine.

At the same time he charged that "in areas where politics and missionary efforts get mixed up together, missionary activity often has certain features to which legitimate objection could be taken."

He also criticized the "inducement and enticement" employed for conversion to faith which he said missionaries offer.

In spite of these criticisms, however, the Pakistan delegate emphasized that "to cast any doubt upon freedom of exchange of belief or faith is to choose a form of remedy that is very much worse than the ill it is designed to cure."—*Religious News Service.*

Author in This Issue

William J. Wolf is Assistant Professor of Systematic Theology on the faculty of the Episcopal Theological Seminary, Cambridge, Massachusetts.